

I oppose the change to the present media ownership rules for the following reasons:

1) Media Giants would buy most of the mainstream media and dominate the information that the average citizen had access to.

Contrary to Commissioner Powell's assertion that there is sufficient diversity in media so that all points of view would be available to the public that is not so. The mainstream media is what the majority of people in the USA watch, read and listen to either because of economic or because of habit. The internet, likewise is becoming a controlled media where the gate-keepers of the search engines determine what one has access to.

2. Big media would result in the death of local news, local advertising and have a very detrimental effect on local politics, security and other vital local issues.

The example of that is seen in the small town which could not get a message about a tornado over the Clear Channel owned radio station because the broadcast was from another city.

3. A democracy requires that there be a fully informed and educated citizen. In a largely controlled news and information situation, this would be the opposite of what would occur.

4. Radio deregulation has been a disaster. Nothing about it has resulted in increased diversity, cheaper access, better programming or anything that is remotely in the public interest.

5. Public (non-commercial) media is now pitifully underfunded and inadequate as a medium to provide an adequate voice for the people that can compete with commercial media as an education vehicle.

If deregulation were to occur, it could only be justified if the FCC required that a huge amount of guaranteed money be used to fund both public access radio and television as well as PBS- and do it on Broadcast tv, not cable.